

PAMELA HARRIS STATE COURT ADMINISTRATOR

(410) 260-1295 Fax: (410) 974-2066 pamela.harris@mdcourts.gov

FAYE D. MATTHEWS
DEPUTY STATE COURT
ADMINISTRATOR
(410) 260-1257 Fax: (410) 974-2066
faye.matthews@mdcourts.gov

SHARON SAMPSON BALL, Director Human Resources (410) 260-1283 Fax: (410) 974-2849 sharon.ball@mdcourts.gov

GRAY BARTON, Director
Office of Problem-Solving Courts
(410) 260-3617 Fax: (410) 260-3620
gray.barton@mdcourts.gov

MARK BITTNER, Director Judicial Information Systems (410) 260-1001 Fax: (410) 974-7170 mark.bittner@mdcourts.gov

GISELA BLADES, Director Procurement & Contract Admin. (410) 260-1594 Fax: (410) 260-2520 gisela.blades@mdcourts.gov

ALLEN C. CLARK, III, Director Budget & Finance (410) 260-1579 Fax: (410) 260-1290 allen.clark@mdcourts.gov

DAVID R. DURFEE JR., Director Legal Affairs (410) 260-1405 Fax: (410) 260-3505 david.durfee@mdcourts.gov

CONNIE KRATOVIL-LAVELLE, Director Family Administration (410) 260-1296 Fax: (410) 974-5577 connie.kratovil-lavelle@mdcourts.gov

ROXANNE P. McKAGAN, Director Facilities Administration (410) 260-1407 Fax: (410) 974-2066 rocky.mckagan@mdcourts.gov

PAMELA C. ORTIZ, Director Access to Justice Commission (410) 260-1258 Fax: (410) 260-2504 pamela.ortiz@mdcourts.gov

DIANE S. PAWLOWICZ, Director Court Operations Department (410) 260-1725 Fax: (410) 260-2503 diane.pawlowicz@mdcourts.gov

DEBORAH A. UNITUS Director, Program Services (410) 260-1256 Fax: (410) 260-3570 deborah.unitus@mdcourts.gov

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS MARYLAND JUDICIAL CENTER 580 TAYLOR AVENUE ANNAPOLIS, MARYLAND 21401

Questions/Responses No. 2 to the Request for Proposal (RFP)
MDEC Audio and Visual Solution
K14-0018-29
October 7, 2013

Ladies and Gentlemen:

The following questions for the above referenced RFP were received by e-mail and are answered and posted for all prospective Master Contractors who received the RFP. The statements and interpretations contained in the following responses to questions are not binding on the Maryland Judiciary unless the RFP is expressly amended. Nothing in the Maryland Judiciary's response to these questions is to be construed as agreement to or acceptance by the Maryland Judiciary of any statement or interpretation on the part of the Master Contractor asking the question.

1) Question: In implementing the Odyssey system, Will each Acer monitor be tied to an individual PC or will there be a central PC tied to all Acer monitors?

Response: The Acer or Judges monitor will be tied to the video system.

2) Question: Are we to provide a video feed only to the Acer monitors? This would leave the USB connectivity for the Odyssey system to those installing Odyssey. Is this correct? If we are to be responsible for more than video feeds to the monitors, please provide us with the Odyssey technical contact for this project.

Response: We will provide the USB connection from the Tiny to the Acer or Judges monitor.

3) Question: Will the annotation be handled only within the Odyssey system or would you like us to provide an annotation solution separate from the Odyssey annotation?

Response: We are not requiring annotation in this bid.

4) Question: There does not appear to be enough space on the podium to place the document camera. Should we include a cart to house the document camera or would you prefer to provide the cart or stand?

Response: We would only require a video connection for a document camera. Some courthouses will not have that equipment.

5) Question: Will all Circuit courtrooms utilize an existing podium or would you like an option for the podium to be provided by us?

Response: Anne Arundel Circuit Courtrooms will use existing podiums.

6) Question: Our interpretation of this item is that if we are awarded the design but not awarded the installation of our design then for the "Design to Test as Accepted" amount we would survey the site, prepare the drawings and then return to the site once the secondary integrator has completed the installation to ensure that the finished product was installed and functioned as we specified in our design. Is this the correct interpretation of the intent of the RFQ

Response: Install for Anne Arundel is included and would be awarded to the same vendor who won the solution part. The court room installation portion is to be proposed as an option, at the sole discretion of the AOC.

Issued by

Lisa Peters Procurement Officer

> TTY Users: 1-800-735-2258 www.mdcourts.gov

